

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

After the present amendment, claims 6, 7, 11-13, 15, 16, 21, 22, 24-26, 28, 30-35, 38-41, 43-55, 57-59, 61-69, 71-73, and 75-101 are pending.

Before the present amendment, claims 6, 7, 11-16, 21, 22, 24-28, and 30-77 were pending. The following table summarizes the status of the claims before the present amendment, after the Office action dated April 22, 2004 ["Office action"].

Claim(s)	Status
Independent claim 6	Rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,335,736 to Wagner et al. ["Wagner"]
Dependent claims 7, 11-15, 25, 26, 31-34, 40, and 42	Rejected as being unpatentable over Wagner
Dependent claims 27, 28, 41, 43, and 44	Objected to as being dependent on rejected base claim(s) but otherwise allowable
Independent claim 16	Allowed
Dependent claims 45-51	Allowed
Independent claim 21	Rejected as being unpatentable over Wagner
Dependent claims 22, 24, 52-55, 58, and 59	Rejected as being unpatentable over Wagner
Dependent claims 56, 57, 60*	Objected to as being dependent on rejected base claim(s) but otherwise allowable
Independent claim 30	Allowed
Dependent claims 61-66	Allowed
Independent claim 35	Rejected as being unpatentable over Wagner
Dependent claims 36, 38, 39, and 67-75	Rejected as being unpatentable over Wagner
Dependent claims 37, 76, and 77	Objected to as being dependent on rejected base claim(s) but otherwise allowable

The Office action indicated claim 60 was allowed, but base claim 21 was not allowed. Applicants assume the status of claim 60 was "objected to" in view of similarities with other objected to claims (e.g., 43, 77). The Office action did not address claim 74.

I. Form 1449s for Information Disclosure Statements

Applicants request the Examiner provide an initialed Form 1449 for the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 3, 2004 (stamped received March 5, 2004), which was filed to

ensure that the art cited in related divisional U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/561,085 is listed on the face of the patent for the present application.

II. Amendments and New Claims

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections set forth in the Office action, but have amended the claims to expedite prosecution.

A. Claim 6 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 27 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have amended claim 6 to include the language from claim 27. Claim 6 and dependent claims 7, 11-13, 15, 25, 26, 28, 31-34, 40, 41, 43, and 44 should be allowable. Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of dependent claims 7, 11-13, 15, 25, 26, 28, 31-34, 40, 41, 43, and 44. Applicants have made various minor revisions to claims 12, 25, and 28.

B. Claim 16 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

In the Office action, the Examiner allowed claim 16. Applicants have made various minor revisions to claim 16. Claim 16 (and its dependent claims 45-51) should still be allowable.

C. Claim 21 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

In the Office action, the Examiner allowed dependent claim 60, which Applicants assume to mean "objected to" claim 60 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have amended claim 21 to include the language from claim 60. Claim 21 and dependent claims 22, 24, 52-55, and 57-59 should be allowable. Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of dependent claims 22, 24, 52-55, and 57-59. Applicants have made various minor revisions to claim 55.

D. Claim 30 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

In the Office action, the Examiner allowed claim 30. Applicants have made various minor revisions to claim 30. Claim 30 (and its dependent claims 61-66) should still be allowable.

E. Claim 35 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

In the Office action, the Examiner objected to dependent claim 37 as being dependent on rejected base claims but otherwise allowable. Applicants have amended claim 35 to include the language from claim 37 as well as intervening claim 36. In addition, Applicants have removed the language “to/from the Internet” from claim 35. Claim 35 and dependent claims 38, 39, 67-69, 71-73, and 75-77 should be allowable. Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of dependent claims 38, 39, 67-69, 71-73, and 75-77. Applicants have made various minor revisions to claims 71-73.

F. New claims 78-101 should be allowable.

Claim 78 and dependent claims 79-81 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 28 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 28 in independent form as new claim 78, including the minor revisions shown for claim 28 in this amendment. Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of dependent claims 79-81.

Claim 82 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 41 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 41 in independent form as new claim 82.

Claim 83 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 43 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 43 in independent form as new claim 83.

Claim 84 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 44 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 44 in independent form as new claim 84.

Claim 85 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 56 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 56 in independent form as new claim 85.

Claim 86 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 57 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 57 in independent form as new claim 86.

Claim 87 and dependent claims 88-94 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 76 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 76 in independent form as new claim 87, removing the language

“to/from the Internet” that was previously in claim 35. Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of dependent claims 88-94.


Claim 95 and dependent claims 96-101 should be allowable. In the Office action, the Examiner objected to claim 77 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Applicants have rewritten claim 77 in independent form as new claim 95, removing the language “to/from the Internet” that was previously in claim 35. Applicants will not belabor the merits of the separate patentability of dependent claims 96-101.

Conclusion

The claims in their present form should now be allowable. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By 
Kyle B. Rinehart
Registration No. 47,027

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 226-7391
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446

(112623.02)